UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,068	07/31/2003	Yen-Fu Chen	AUS920030521US1	3486

45371	7590	05/30/2006

IBM CORPORATION (RUS)
c/o Rudolf O Siegesmund Gordon & Rees, LLp
2100 Ross Avenue
Suite 2600
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER
STALLARD, JOSEPH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3715	

DATE MAILED: 05/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/631,068	CHEN ET AL.
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit	
		J. Andrew Stallard	3715	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-41* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-41* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>7/31/2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/31/2003</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 27-30, 32-34, 36-38 and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as

being anticipated by Parry et al. (US 6,077,085).

Claim 27: Parry discloses a program product operable on a computer, the program

product comprising: a computer-usable medium, wherein the computer usable medium

comprises instructions comprising: a Selection Program (*col. 2, 50-52*) and a Testing

Program (*col. 13, 32-34*).

Claim 28: Parry discloses selecting a chapter from a plurality of chapters (*col. 7, 21-42;*

Subject matter can be organized according to conceptual principles taught by the

subject matter. A conceptual principle can be selected, and then subject matter can be

gathered based on these conceptual principles. These conceptual principles can also

be considered chapters, since they both organize subject matter by topics.); selecting

the question language from a plurality of question languages; and selecting the answer

language from a plurality of answer languages (*col. 2, 50-52; A primary language and a*

foreign language can be selected. In the case of the question and answer (col. 13, 32-

34), the question language (native language) would be the primary language, and the answer language (target language) would be the foreign language.).

Claim 29: Parry discloses displaying the vocabulary for review by a user (*col. 2, 62-65*).

Claims 30 and 32: Parry discloses displaying statistics regarding a user's performance in answering a plurality of questions (*col. 27, 1; Statistics can be displayed, such as number of questions correct out of the total number of questions on a particular. For example, according to the first statistic, the user's performance on the 19 questions comprises getting 7 questions correct out of the 19 total questions.*).

Claims 33 and 34: Parry discloses calculating the probability factors for a plurality of vocabulary terms; and wherein the probability factor determines the frequency with which a vocabulary term will be asked in a question (*col. 3, 13-17; Concepts, including vocabulary terms, can be included in exercises at a frequency according to the student's mastery of the concept.*).

Claim 36: Parry discloses wherein responsive to a determination that the answer is correct, decrementing a probability factor for the vocabulary term (*col. 3, 2-5; The system can recognize if a student answers correctly and decrease the probability of encountering the term again.*).

Claim 37: Parry discloses responsive to a determination that the answer is incorrect, incrementing a probability factor for the vocabulary term (*col. 18, 40-46; col. 18, 54 – col. 19,55*).

Claim 38: The method of claim 1 further comprising: wherein responsive to a determination that all of the vocabulary terms in a chapter have a probability factor

equal to one, indicating that the chapter is completed (*col. 19, 51-55; When all of the vocabulary items have moved out of the review pool (and thus have no probability of being encountered any more) and into the test pool, the chapter is completed.*).

Claim 40: Parry discloses wherein the question language is Traditional Chinese, Simplified Chinese, Pin Yin, or English (*col. 2, 18-24; The language can be English.*).

Claim 41: Parry discloses wherein the answer language is Traditional Chinese, Simplified Chinese, Pin Yin, or English (*col. 2, 18-24; The language can be English.*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 12-19, 21, 23, 25-26 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry et al. (US 6,077,085) in view of Chu (US 5,444,445).

Claims 1 and 31: Parry discloses a method for reviewing vocabulary comprising: asking a question containing a vocabulary term in a question language; accepting an answer in an answer language (*col. 13, 32-34*). Parry discloses comparing strings of different languages (*col. 2, 49-50; A multilingual language database can be used, including Japanese (col. 2, 18-24). For a vocabulary review activity, a user can type the*

target language translation of word (col. 13, 32-34). To determine whether the typed word is the correct translation, the typed word must be stored and then compared to the correct translation. This activity involves comparing words of various different languages, including English and Japanese.), but Parry is silent as to the format used to store the strings. Chu teaches using Unicode to store multilingual text (*col. 1, 42-49*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention from the teaching of Chu for the method of Parry to use the Unicode string format of Chu to store multilingual text.

Claims 2 and 15: Parry discloses selecting a chapter from a plurality of chapters (*col. 7, 21-42; Subject matter can be organized according to conceptual principles taught by the subject matter. A conceptual principle can be selected, and then subject matter can be gathered based on these conceptual principles. These conceptual principles can also be considered chapters, since they both organize subject matter by topics.*); selecting the question language from a plurality of question languages; and selecting the answer language from a plurality of answer languages (*col. 2, 50-52; A primary language and a foreign language can be selected. In the case of the question and answer (col. 13, 32-34), the question language (native language) would be the primary language, and the answer language (target language) would be the foreign language.*).

Claims 3 and 16: Parry discloses displaying the vocabulary for review by a user (*col. 2, 62-65*).

Claims 4 and 17: Parry discloses displaying statistics regarding a user's performance in answering a plurality of questions (*col. 27, 1; Statistics can be displayed, such as*

number of questions correct out of the total number of questions on a particular. For example, according to the first statistic, the user's performance on the 19 questions comprises getting 7 questions correct out of the 19 total questions.).

Claims 5, 6, 18 and 19: Parry discloses calculating the probability factors for a plurality of vocabulary terms; and wherein the probability factor determines the frequency with which a vocabulary term will be asked in a question (*col. 3, 13-17; Concepts, including vocabulary terms, can be included in exercises at a frequency according to the student's mastery of the concept.).*

Claims 8 and 21: Parry discloses wherein responsive to a determination that the answer is correct, decrementing a probability factor for the vocabulary term (*col. 3, 2-5; The system can recognize if a student answers correctly and decrease the probability of encountering the term again.).*

Claims 9 and 22: Parry discloses responsive to a determination that the answer is incorrect, incrementing a probability factor for the vocabulary term (*col. 18, 40-46; col. 18, 54 – col. 19,55).*

Claims 10 and 23: The method of claim 1 further comprising: wherein responsive to a determination that all of the vocabulary terms in a chapter have a probability factor equal to one, indicating that the chapter is completed (*col. 19, 51-55; When all of the vocabulary items have moved out of the review pool (and thus have no probability of being encountered any more) and into the test pool, the chapter is completed.).*

Claims 12 and 25: Parry discloses wherein the question language is Traditional

Chinese, Simplified Chinese, Pin Yin, or English (*col. 2, 18-24; The language can be*

English.).

Claims 13 and 26: Parry discloses wherein the answer language is Traditional

Chinese, Simplified Chinese, Pin Yin, or English (*col. 2, 18-24; The language can be*

English.).

Claim 14: Parry discloses a program product operable on a computer, the program

product comprising: a computer-usable medium; wherein the computer usable medium

comprises instructions (*Fig. 1*).

Claims 7, 20 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Parry et al. (US 6,077,085) in view of Zhong (US 5,319,552) and

Andrews et al. (US 5,309,358) and Chu (US 5,444,445).

Parry discloses applicant's basic inventive concept of a method for reviewing

vocabulary, substantially as claimed, but does not expressly disclose using a

Simplified/Traditional Chinese Conversion Table and a Traditional Chinese/Pin

Yin/English Dictionary to perform the determination whether the answer is correct using

Unicode step. Zhong discloses using a Chinese conversion table (*31*) and a dictionary

(*35*) for language input and conversion (*col. 7, 3-30*). Andrews discloses using

conversion tables to convert between Traditional and Simplified Chinese (*col. 9, 27-31*).

Chu teaches using Unicode format to store strings, and Unicode format stores

characters for multiple languages (*col. 1, 56-63*). It would benefit the method of Parry to

also include Chinese (including Traditional and Simplified) in the languages a user can review. The conversion table and dictionary of Zhong would allow the user to input Chinese language words. The Unicode strings of Chu would allow the method to store the Chinese language words after they are input. The Traditional and Simplified Chinese conversion tables would allow the user to review Traditional and Simplified Chinese. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention from the teaching of Zhong, Andrews and Chu to modify the method of Parry by using the conversion table and dictionary of Zhong, the Traditional and Simplified Chinese conversion table of Andrews, and the Unicode strings of Chu to allow the user to review Chinese, including Traditional and Simplified Chinese.

Claims 11 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry et al. (US 6,077,085) in view of Chu (US 5,444,445) as applied to claims 1, 14 and 27 above, and further in view of Chien (US 2002/0085018).

Parry discloses applicant's basic inventive concept of a method for reviewing vocabulary, substantially as claimed, but does not expressly disclose changing the font size of the Chinese characters displayed on a graphical user interface. Chien discloses changing the font size of Chinese characters (*[0019]*). In looking for ways to display language characters, including Japanese, on the user interface, one could look to Chien for displaying foreign language characters, since Chinese and Japanese characters are similar. It would benefit the method of Parry to use the teachings of Chien to allow the

font sizes of the Japanese language characters to be changed. Since Parry teaches that it would be desirable to allow the method to be used in many different countries (*col. 2, 16-24*), it would also benefit the method of Parry, to include Chinese as one of the languages for a user to learn. In which case, the method of Parry would use the teachings of Chien to allow the font sizes of the Chinese characters to be changed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention from the teaching of Chien to modify the method of Parry by including the changing of Chinese character font sizes of Chien to allow more display and language choices for the user.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry et al. (US 6,077,085) in view of Chien (US 2002/0085018).

Parry discloses applicant's basic inventive concept of a method for reviewing vocabulary, substantially as claimed, but does not expressly disclose changing the font size of the Chinese characters displayed on a graphical user interface. Chien discloses changing the font size of Chinese characters (*[0019]*). In looking for ways to display language characters, including Japanese, on the user interface, one could look to Chien for displaying foreign language characters, since Chinese and Japanese characters are similar. It would benefit the method of Parry to use the teachings of Chien to allow the font sizes of the Japanese language characters to be changed. Since Parry teaches that it would be desirable to allow the method to be used in many different countries (*col. 2, 16-24*), it would also benefit the method of Parry, to include Chinese as one of

the languages for a user to learn. In which case, the method of Parry would use the teachings of Chien to allow the font sizes of the Chinese characters to be changed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention from the teaching of Chien to modify the method of Parry by including the changing of Chinese character font sizes of Chien to allow more display and language choices for the user.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ma et al. (US 2002/0069047) discloses a foreign language vocabulary test.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Andrew Stallard whose telephone number is (571) 272-2685. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:15 am to 6:45 pm - Mon - Fri (1st Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (571) 272-6678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

J. Andrew Stallard
Examiner
Art Unit 3715

5/25/06

ROBERT P. OLSZEWSKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700